

Amendment to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1A, 3, 5, 6, and 7. These sheets replace the original sheets. In Fig. 1A, a reference numeral 10 has been added. In Fig. 3, a reference numeral 70 has been added. In Fig. 5, a reference numeral 60 has been added. In Fig. 6, a reference numeral 105 has been added. In Fig. 7, reference numerals 150, 40, and 50 has been replaced by reference numerals 201, 50, and 60, respectively.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

REMARKS

Claims 10 to 28 were pending. Applicant has amended claims 10, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 27, and 28.

Amendments to the Specification and Drawings

Applicant has amended the specification and drawings to improve clarity and correct typographical errors. In particular, Applicant notes that the reference numerals for the scanning mirror control unit and the reflecting mirror unit in paragraph [0038] and Fig. 7 have been amended to be consistent with the reference numerals used in Figs. 1 to 4.

§102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 20, 23, 25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,450,219 ("Gold et al.").

Amended claim 20 now recites "a reflecting mirror system for raster scanning the light beam over an area to be illuminated, wherein said raster scanning comprises moving the light beam along horizontal and vertical directions." Amended claim 20 (emphasis added). Exemplary horizontal and vertical movements of a raster scan are illustrated in Figs. 3, 4, 5, 6 of the present disclosure.

Gold et al. does not disclose a raster scan that involves both horizontal and vertical movement of the light beam. Instead, Gold et al. discloses that a rotatable scanner 16 directs a narrow light band to illuminate one entire line at a time down a light valve 11.

Optical apparatus that condenses illuminating light into a narrow formatted band of light that follows activated lines down a light vale as it is driven.

....

Since the input image or light is made t cover a small field angle than is required to illuminate the entire light valve 11, the rotation of the rotatable scanner 16 varies the angle of the bundle of chief rays, thus moving the narrow light band of light illumination along the face of the light valve, indicated by the directional arrow 23.

Gold et al., Abstract and col. 4, lines 3 to 9 (emphasis added). Accordingly, amended claim 20 is patentable over Gold et al.

Claim 23 depends from claim 20 and is patentable over Gold et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 20.

Applicant has amended claim 25 to also recite “raster scanning [that] comprises moving the light beam along horizontal and vertical directions.” Amended claim 25. Thus, claim 25 is patentable over Gold et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 20.

Claim 27 depends from claim 25 and is patentable over Gold et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 25.

§103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 10 to 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gold et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,971,545 (“Haitz”).

Applicant has amended claim 10 to also recite “raster scanning [that] comprises moving the light beam along horizontal and vertical directions,” which is neither disclosed or suggested by either Gold et al. or Haitz. Amended claim 10. Thus, claim 10 is patentable over the combination of Gold et al. and Haitz.

Claims 11 to 15, 18, and 19 depend from claim 10 and are patentable over the combination of Gold et al. and Haitz for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Furthermore, claim 13 recites that “the image is an existing image on a medium ... and the light beam is raster scanned to illuminate the existing image,” which are not disclosed or suggested by either Gold et al. or Haitz. Amended claim 13 (emphasis added). Instead, both Gold et al. and Haitz disclose generating an image using light valve devices instead of illuminating an existing image already on a medium. Accordingly, claim 13 is further patentable over the combination of Gold et al. and Haitz.

Applicant has addressed claim 20 in the prior section where the Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 20 and are patentable over Gold et al. and Haitz for at least the same reasons as claim 20 discussed above.

Claim 26 depends from claim 25 and is patentable over Gold et al. and Haitz for at least the same reasons as claim 25 discussed above.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 16, 17, 24, and 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 16, 24, and 28 to independent form. Claim 17 depends from claim 16 and therefore remains unchanged now that claim 16 is allowable.

Summary

In summary, claims 10 to 28 were pending when last examined. Applicant has amended claims 10, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 27, and 28. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the claim rejections and allow claims 10 to 28. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at (408) 382-0480 x206.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

10/27/05

Date

Respectfully submitted,



David C. Hsia
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 46,235



Appl. No. 10/723,400
Amendment Dated October 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2005
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

FIG. 1A




FIG. 3




FIG. 5




FIG. 6




FIG. 7

